

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/775,315	02/01/2001	Hyun-Sook Jung	41671/DBP/Y35	8247	
23363 7	590 06/29/2005		EXAMINER		
•	ARKER & HALE, LLI	MERCADO, JULIAN A			
PO BOX 7068	CA 91109-7068		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
1113/122141,	0.1 /110/ /000		1745		

DATE MAILED: 06/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application	on No.	Applicant(s)			
		09/775,31	15	JUNG ET AL.	\sim		
Office	Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit			
		Julian Mer	cado	1745			
The MAILI Period for Reply	NG DATE of this commun	nication appears on the	cover sheet with th	e correspondence address	S		
THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time ma after SIX (6) MONTHS - If the period for reply - If NO period for reply - Failure to reply within Any reply received by	STATUTORY PERIOD F ATE OF THIS COMMUN as be available under the provisions from the mailing date of this come specified above is less than thirty (3 is specified above, the maximum s the set or extended period for reply the Office later than three months ljustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	IICATION. s of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no eve munication. 30) days, a reply within the statu tatutory period will apply and wil v will. by statute, cause the appl	ent, however, may a reply but utory minimum of thirty (30) Il expire SIX (6) MONTHS fi lication to become ABANDO	e timely filed days will be considered timely. rom the mailing date of this commun NED (35 U.S.C.§ 133).	ication.		
Status							
1)⊠ Responsive	e to communication(s) file	ed on <u>19 <i>April</i> 2005</u> .					
2a)☐ This action							
•	and the second s						
Disposition of Clain	ns						
4a) Of the a 5) ☐ Claim(s) 6) ☑ Claim(s) 1- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 8) ☐ Claim(s) Application Papers 9) ☐ The specific 10) ☐ The drawing Applicant management		are withdrawn from concion and/or election received examiner. a: a) □ accepted or b) ection to the drawing(s) beginners require	equirement. objected to by the held in abeyance. ed if the drawing(s) is	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). objected to. See 37 CFR 1.			
11)☐ The oath or	declaration is objected t	to by the Examiner. No	ote the attached Off	ice Action or form PTO-1	52.		
Priority under 35 U.	•						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of Reference 2) Notice of Draftspers	son's Patent Drawing Review (ure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 o		4) Interview Summ Paper No(s)/Ma 5) Notice of Inform 6) Other:)		

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on April 19, 2005 has been entered.

Claims 1-4 and 10 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Mayer. (U.S. Pat. 5,783,333).

The rejection is maintained for the reasons of record and for the additional reasons not yet discussed in response to applicant's present amendment to the pending claims. Independent claim 10 has been amended to recite that the binder is evaporated from the mixture during heat-treating. This process limitation is not given patentable weight as the limitation does not give breadth or scope to the product claim. The claimed product appears to be the same or similar to

Art Unit: 1745

the prior art product insofar as being a positive active material produced by mixing lithium nickel cobalt oxide with lithium magnesium oxides insofar as these very same composite materials are blended together to form a positive electrode, moreover, since the binder is evaporated it is not positively present in the final formed product. (col. 10 line 48 et seq.) In the event that any differences can be shown by the product of the product-by-process claim such differences would have been obvious to the skilled artisan as a routine modification of the product absent of a showing of unexpected results. *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Applicant's arguments filed with the present amendment have been fully considered, however they are not found persuasive. Applicant submits that Mayer discloses only evaporation of the solvent in which the binder is provided and not the binder itself. In reply, it appears to the examiner that what Mayer discloses as the solvent is in actuality the "solution of the binder." (col. 12 line 60) Thus, when Mayer discloses that the solvent of the slurry is evaporated, the solution of the binder is evaporated not unlike what is required by claim 10.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pynenburg et al. (U.S. Pat. 5,429,890) in view of Hasegawa et al. (U.S. Pat. 5,370,948).

The rejection is maintained for the reasons of record. Arguments against Pynenburg et al. appear to be a reiteration of those submitted in the response filed March 30, 2005. These arguments are believed fully address in the Advisory action sent April 20, 2005, herein incorporated by reference.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Julian Mercado whose telephone number is (571) 272-1289. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick J. Ryan, can be reached on (571) 272-1292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

PATRICK JOSEPH RYAN SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER